

Mr. President, the Prime Minister knew that the status quo was unacceptable. He knew that the status quo extended to the future would only mean that Israeli children and Palestinian children would be killing each other for generations to come.

He gave his life for peace. He was a general. He defended his country. He was a military hero. But in the last analysis, at the very end, he gave his life for security for his country and for peace for the peoples of the Middle East.

His loss is not only the loss of Israel, his loss is the loss of the peoples of the Middle East, and his loss is the loss to all of us—all of us—who live in this world.

So, colleagues, I think that the way that we honor this man, Prime Minister Rabin, is by dedicating ourselves to the peace process. Whenever our country can facilitate negotiations, we should do so. Whenever our country can continue the work of Dennis Roth and others who have been so skillful in helping to mediate and keep these negotiations going, we should do so.

When there are terms of the agreement that we are asked to follow through on such as financial aid, economic development, aid to Palestinian people, that the Prime Minister was so much for, we should support that.

Mr. President, I hope this does not lead to a period of darkness. Certainly, it feels that way now. This is a nightmare of the world. Let us dedicate ourselves to the peace process. Let us do as public servants what the Prime Minister was able to do. He took the moral position. He did not know how the elections would turn out, but he did what he thought was the right thing.

His example of leadership was an example of leadership not just for Israel but for all us that are in public service in all countries throughout the world.

As a Senator from Minnesota, as the son of a Jewish immigrant from the Ukraine and Russia, LEON WELLSTONE, as the son of a daughter of Ukrainian immigrants, Mincha Daneshevsky, as a father, grandfather, a Senator from Minnesota, and an American Jew, I was so proud to be there yesterday.

I hope I can live my life, with my family and in my community, and as a Senator, in such a way that I honor this man.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order, the Senator from North Dakota has 10 minutes.

#### YITZHAK RABIN

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I did not hear the entire statement of the Senator from Minnesota, but I visited with him on the way to the Chamber today about his trip to Israel to the funeral. I commend him for what I did hear him say.

I think all of us join in offering our prayers and condolences to the people of Israel and the family of Yitzhak Rabin.

I have had on my desk for slightly over a year, a printed copy of the remarks Yitzhak Rabin gave to a joint meeting of Congress in 1994. The reason the remarks have been on my desk for a year is I was so moved when I heard him speak, in the House Chamber, in such eloquent terms about his search for peace in the Middle East, that I thought I had not in many, many years heard anything quite so beautiful or so profound or so powerful as those words. I have kept them near for some long while. All of us grieve for what has happened to Yitzhak Rabin and for the people of Israel in these days of tragedy.

#### A HOUSING PROGRAM FOR MIDDLE-AGED RICH MEN

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, in these days of government spending cutbacks there is one notable exception: public housing programs for middle-aged rich owners of professional sports teams.

Yesterday's announcement that the Cleveland Browns will move to Baltimore demonstrates once again that these rich folks who play monopoly games with their football, baseball, and basketball team franchises can play city off against city to hammerlock officials and fans to pay for expensive, new taxpayer financed sports stadiums in which they can house their privately owned teams.

There is insufficient money for public housing for poor people in America, but the sky is the limit for public housing for those rich folks who own professional sports teams and who insist the taxpayers build them a place to play.

No owner of a professional football, baseball, basketball, or hockey team will ever be homeless. Governments—local, State, and Federal—will see to it that there are enough public resources available to build stadiums worth hundreds of millions of dollars with sky boxes for the affluent. Governments will virtually guarantee that money from parking, concessions, and sky boxes will make rich owners richer and overpaid athletes financially fat and happy.

The thing about this that irritates me is that taxpayers in our part of the country: North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming—help in both direct and indirect ways to pay for this housing program for rich sports owners.

But there will never be a press conference in which a major sports team owner announces he is moving his team to Bismarck or Cheyenne or Helena.

This little monopoly game that bestows enormous economic awards on certain regions of the country is a private domain played between the wealthy sports owners and the largest cities of America. The rest of us are required, through lost tax revenue, to help pay the bills.

Yesterday's announcement about the Cleveland Browns moving to Baltimore is apparently a result of a promise of a

new \$200 million stadium in Baltimore to be used rent-free for 7 years by the Browns' owner. Skybox, parking, and concession revenues go to the owner as well. In addition, the owner apparently received \$75 million as a bonus for moving the team.

I do not know the owner of the Cleveland Browns from a cord of wood so I am not judging him. And he is not alone in moving a sports team in search of more money. And team owners are no different than athletes: they are two peas in a pod. They jump ship and leave town in search of more money. It is all about money—money for the owners and money for the athletes.

Fans are the pawns who end up paying the bills through ticket prices and taxes. Fans are reduced to rooting for uniforms rather than people. The star athlete in one city one week may well end up playing against that city the next week as a result of trades or moves by athletes and owners in search of the highest dollar.

In circumstances where monopolies rule the day—and they do in professional sports—you cannot start an NBA team in Bismarck, or you cannot start an NFL team in Sioux Falls. Money and control replace the benefits of competition, and everyone pays except the owners and the athletes.

I would not take the time to comment on this issue, except that what is happening in professional sports is a perversion. This is about big guys and big money, and the little guy is damned. And guess who ends up paying for the sports stadiums and who ends up paying for those lucrative salaries for the athletes and handsome profits for the owners? The little guy. The fact is, professional sports is sticking its finger in the fan's eye.

A story last week pointed out the cost of taking a family of four to a National Basketball Association professional game this season has risen to \$192, up 10 percent from last year. It costs about \$130 for four tickets, an average of \$32 per ticket, and you have to add some hot dogs, a program and a cap so the cost for four people adds up to nearly \$200 to attend a game. Something is wrong; something is terribly wrong in professional sports when we have come to that. And ticket prices for hockey and football are even higher.

I think that Congress ought to hold some hearings on the subject of professional sports: where it has been; where it is going; who profits, by how much, and at whose expense.

Why is it in 1995 that the only healthy public housing program is one to build sports stadiums for rich, middle-aged sports owners? Why, when so many cities would like to host a professional sports team, do the leagues restrict expansion unreasonably, so that existing teams can extract outrageous ticket prices from citizens who have no alternatives?

I think it is reasonable for our country to ask whether these monopolies,

where a few rich owners can make judgments about where to bestow hundreds of millions of dollars of economic benefits to one region or another or one city or another, are in concert with the interests of our economy and our country.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I will take a moment to bid farewell to my friend Yitzhak Rabin. I was unable to attend the funeral due to some family responsibilities, but had an opportunity to get to know the Prime Minister well in his visits to the United States. And to speak to him three or four times a year about the foreign aid program for Israel and other issues related to the Middle East.

Not only has Israel lost a great statesman but the world has lost one of the premier figures of this century.

#### CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I noted with interest last week the testimony of the Speaker of the House before the House Oversight Committee on the subject of campaign finance reform and the reaction to the Speaker's speech here in the Senate last Friday by two of our colleagues.

Let me say, we are back into it again. The biennial assault on the first amendment has begun anew.

The Speaker of the House last week, in addressing this issue in some of the most skillful and brilliant testimony I have seen or been privileged to hear, pointed out that this debate is about the first amendment. We are talking about free speech and the doling out of the ability to communicate in a free society.

Some of my colleagues here on Friday ridiculed the Speaker for stating what is perfectly obvious—that we do not spend enough on campaigns in this country, not nearly enough.

As a matter of fact, it is interesting to note that in the 1993-94 cycle, the most recent 2-year cycle of congressional elections, congressional campaigns spent about what the American public spent in 1 year on bubble gum. I repeat, Mr. President, in the last congressional cycle, we spent on congressional campaigns what Americans spend in 1 year on bubble gum. And about half of what they spend on yogurt, and about half what they spend on potato chips.

So where did this notion get going that we were spending too much in campaigns? Compared to what? Compared to what? When you look at any sensible comparison, we are spending a pittance communicating with voters and expressing ourselves in the American political system.

Commercial advertising in 1992 was \$44 billion. The cost of democracy, if you will, in the 1993-94 cycle was \$724 million—as I said, roughly what Americans spent on bubble gum that year.

Another way of looking at it, Mr. President, per eligible voter spending was about \$3.74. That would get you an extra-value meal at McDonald's. The equivalent of a burger, fries, and a Coke is not too much to spend to communicate with the American voter.

Prof. Bradley Smith, in a work released by the Cato Institute, recently observed that Sony is spending more to promote Michael Jackson's latest album than the 1994 Republican Senate nominee in California spent. That is a race that a lot of people like to focus on, even though on a per capita basis there was less spending in California than in a number of other States.

Newsweek columnist Robert Samuelson noted in an August 1995 column that campaign spending is tiny—five or six one-hundredths of 1 percent of the gross domestic product. This is up from three one-hundredths of one percent in the 1960's. As Samuelson put it, it hardly seems a high price to pay for democracy.

David Broder in the Washington Post in June of 1993 said:

Communication is the heart of campaign politics, and candidates are competing, not just with each other, but with all the other messages being beamed at the American public. The added cost of the 1992 campaign was the direct byproduct of a very desirable change—a marked increase in competition. There were 1,200 more congressional candidates in 1992 than in 1990—a 63 percent increase.

So Broder pointed out that:

It is illogical to welcome the infusion of energy and ideas represented by the largest freshman class in 44 years and condemn the cost of their campaigns.

He is talking about the 1992 class.

Broder concluded in that article:

Few politicians in today's cynical climate want to tell the voters the truth. If you want competitive politics, make up your mind that it is going to be relatively expensive. Democracy, like other good things, is not cost-free.

But expensive compared to what? It is said time after time on the floor of the Senate that campaign spending is out of control. It is just not true. There is no basis for that. And it is repeated as if it were fact.

We spend a pittance on politics in this country. And, as the Speaker pointed out last week, we really ought to be spending more. To the extent that our speech is restrained by some artificial Government-imposed effort to restrict it, others will fill the void. As the Speaker pointed out, the void left by the limits—if we had limits on our speech—would be further filled by the media, in addition to other powerful entities.

A Member of this body on this floor last Friday blasted as "ludicrous" the Speaker's observation that over half the money he raises is to offset the Atlanta Journal and Constitution. The Senator further noted that his opponent is not the newspaper. Maybe this colleague of ours who was lambasting the Speaker enjoys a great relationship with his newspaper, but he ought to try

to be on this side of the aisle doing battle with the liberal newspapers across America. To conservatives, the undeniably and repeatedly proven liberal slant of the media is an opponent. Of course, all those newspapers would love to restrain our speech so their speech would be enhanced.

I have ruminated at some length on this over the years, including a 1994 piece for the New York Times entitled "The Press as Power Broker," and another for USA Today, also last year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that both of those articles be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 18, 1994]

THE PRESS AS POWER BROKER

(By Mitch McConnell)

WASHINGTON.—In political campaigns, paid advertisements are speech amplifiers—the only practical way for candidates to speak directly to large numbers of voters. That is why the Supreme Court ruled, in *Buckley v. Valeo* (1976), that involuntary spending limits are an unconstitutional infringement of free speech.

Now, in the name of campaign reform, the Senate and House have both passed "voluntary" spending limits for Congressional campaigns. But while they aim to equalize spending between candidates, these limits would distort the political process, creating a whole new set of power brokers—including, perhaps not coincidentally, some of the loudest cheerleaders for the new spending limits: America's largest newspapers.

To get around the Supreme Court ruling, the bills would not explicitly require spending limits. Instead, candidates would be bludgeoned into compliance by a panoply of heavy penalties. These schemes, which have the enthusiastic support of the New York Times, among other papers, are voluntary in name only.

Under the Senate bill, candidates who refused to abide by the limits would have their campaign receipts taxed at the full corporate rate, currently 35 percent. They would be required to include self-incriminating disclaimers in their ads and their campaigns would be saddled with extra reporting requirements. That is just for starters.

When noncomplying candidates went even a penny over the "voluntary" limit, their opponents would receive a Government grant equal to one-third of the limit. The more that noncomplying candidates spent above the limit, the more tax dollars their complying opponents would get.

The Senate bill also provides for Government grants to counteract independent expenditures by private citizens or groups for or against any complying candidate. If David Duke decided to run for the Senate and the N.A.A.C.P. or B'nai B'rith decided to spend money in opposition to his candidacy, he would be eligible for dollar-for-dollar matching funds to fight back. And ask yourself this: if an independently financed ad urged people to "Support Senator X—she voted 50 times to raise your taxes," which candidate would get the money to counteract it?

The more a candidate's campaign was hamstrung by a limit on spending (and speech), the more powerful other players would become—labor unions, religious groups, anyone with an agenda to promote. In particular, newspapers would emerge unscathed from this "reform," perfectly situated to fill the communications void created by the spending limits. Their power to make or break